DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 199 361 UD 021 335

AUTHOR	Vitullo-Martin, Thomas
TITLE	The Role of the School in the Neighborhood. A Report to the National Institute of Education.
INSTITUTION	National Center for Urban Ethnic Affairs, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Jun 80
GRANT	400-76-0088
NOTE	55p.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Community Development: Economic Factors: *Educational Research: Elementary Secondary Education: Family School Relationship: Inner City: Literature Reviews: *Neighborhood Improvement: Parent Role: Political Influences: Power Structure: Private Schools: Public Schools: Research Needs: Residential Patterns: School Closing: *School Community Relationship: *School Role: School Segregation: Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS	White Flight

ABSTRACT

This paper reviews the principal literature on schools and communities to find evidence that schools perform community-shaping functions. Section I discusses problems in the field of educational research that have led observers to neglect the school-neighborhood relationship. Sociological, anthropological, and political studies of communities that provide evidence of the effects schools have on neighborhood politics, organization, and development are presented in Section II. Section III reviews studies that examine the community-supporting impacts of private and public schools: discusses the effect on the community when public schools are closed: and reports on the impact of school desegregation on communities. Section IV reviews the literature on the relationship between schools and neighborhood demographic change. Research objectives for examinations of the organizational and economic impacts of public and private schools are outlined in the final section. (Author/MK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

MAR 2 1 1981

ED199361

THE ROLE OF THE SCHOOL IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD

A Report to the National Institute of Education

#400-76-0088

Thomas Vitullo-Martin
National Center for Urban Ethnic Affairs

Washington, June, 1980

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

UD021335

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the National Institute of Education, Department of Education. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official National Institute of Education position or policy.
Grant No. 400-76-0088

Studies of schools and communities present evidence that schools have community impacts which transcend their role as educators of children. There is no systematic description or analysis of these effects in education literature.

Schools shape communities in a number of ways. They are catalysts for the formation of formal and informal social structures. They actively organize the community, either to support the school or to work on community problems that leaders of the school believe affect its fortunes. Schools attract one or another kind of family to their districts, and thus directly affect housing values and costs, as well as the social and economic composition of a neighborhood. Schools can also affect families directly, strengthening or weakening their structures, stimulating or dulling their concern for the education of their children. Indirectly, the effects schools have on families may become effects on the neighborhood itself.

Schools can weaken or strengthen community structures. Policies that change schools can change communities. The research link between school and community needs definition · How do schools affect the development of a community's organizations, political strength, economic vitality, social structure (especially the relationships between neighborhood residents), and sense of self-identity?

Research on the community-shaping function of schools promises important payoffs. As the problems of urban decay have increased and spread, public officials have given education lower priority. This research, however, will connect education to its concern with declining neighborhoods, and especially to an important change in the way leading experts have begun to view the solutions to the problem of urban conservation and development. Formerly, community development experts called for major public and private capital reinvestment in the infrastructures of the communities: their streets, lighting, water and sewerage lines, transportation, parks, commercial buildings, and housing. The first efforts at rehabilitation

through capital investment had spotty success. It became increasingly apparent that some communities had a greater potential for survival than others. Capital expenditures in some neighborhoods were lost almost immediately--the new facilities stolen, burned out, or simply not used. In others, the investments were successful, fostering neighborhood stability and growth. The difference, according to many housing and community development experts, lay in the social organization of the community--its ability both to establish and maintain social rules that protect and make use of valuable investments and to convey to people a sense of confidence about the future of the area.

Schools seem to have the ability to encourage the development of the social rules, the growth of formal organizations, the political voice, and the sense of self-identify and pride that a neighborhood needs in order to make use of the capital investment designed to save it. To an extent, schools may deliberately direct their efforts at community improvements. But schools may not intend many of the community-building effects they have. It is a common political phenomenon that organizations born for a single issue, or a limited purpose, often continue after the organizing issue is passed and often take on objectives only remotely related to the initial organizing purpose. In this sense, then, schools may sometimes provide the forum and perhaps even some of the structures around which communities organize and find their voice. Conversely, schools may demoralize existing organizations, convincing them of their powerlessness. The questions are: How effective are schools in aiding the development of the community? What are the most effective devices? What do schools do that harms communities? What kinds of schools are best for what kinds of community conditions?

The Plan of this Paper: A small number of works present some discussion of the community impacts of schools, but none treat the question systematically. This paper reviews the principal literature discussing schools and communityes for evidence, often inadvertent, that schools perform some community-shaping function.

These functions then become the basis for a set of minimal research objectives outlined in the final section. This paper does not attempt to provide a theoretic underpinning for any school-community study. Concepts in anthropology, sociology, economics or politics, or concern with the development of the ethos of a community, with organization theory, political economy, or any of a number of other organizing frameworks could equally and fruitfully be followed.

The discussion is divided into five sections:

Section I: Problems in the field of education research have lead observers to neglect the school-neighborhood relationship; these must be overcome if the research called for is to succeed.

Section II: Sociological, anthropological, and political studies of communities provide evidence of the effects schools have on neighborhood politics, social organization, and development.

Section III: Three types of studies have at least partially examined the community-supporting impacts of schools: those concerned with parish schools and those concerned with the closing of public schools, especially during the rural consolidation movement. In particular, the parochial school studies, which were primarily concerned with the impact of the schools on the parish, may provide an analytic model for the impact of schools on neighborhoods. A neighborhood is a kind of secular parish.

Section IV: Studies of the determinants of the housing market, and the recent discussion of the political economy of schools, suggest ways in which schools shape communities.

Section V: Research directed at the organizational and economic impacts of public and private schools must be designed to identify the range of ways that schools can and do affect the development, stability, and life of neighborhoods, the variety of types of neighborhoods, and the kinds of impacts schools have.

Conventional wisdom has it that when schools decline, neighborhoods decline. The point has even been accepted in the federal district courts, which have incorporated, in a number of rulings, the notion that there are "tipping points" in the majority-minority proportion of enrollments in schools.[1] A "tipping point," which presumably varies from community to community, is the putative point where an increase in the minority proportion convinces white families the school is in decline and encourages them to flee. Thus it is not integration itself that causes the flight--the school typically is integrated for some time before the whites actually begin to "flee"--but a belief about the school's future that triggers the flight.[2]

There is a basis for the conventional wisdom in the relatively unsystematic observations of real estate brokers. Brokers tout homes as being in good school districts. They report large differences in the selling prices of similar homes on the same street assigned to different school districts. In the recent past, if not now, brokers steered prospective clients away from homes in the attendance areas of integrated schools.

A number of observers of neighborhood development, and of school politics, have suggested that schools play an important role in the organization and cohesion of neighborhoods and of larger communities. These observers argue that education research has ignored a fundamental aspect of how schools affect urban areas, at a high cost both to community development and to education itself. It has been an important objective of federal and state community development and housing programs for the past decade, at least, to try to control the pattern of the decay of neighborhoods and their institutions, neighborhood and urban depopulation, and the increasingly serious problems of the concentration of lower-income and minority families in segregated political jurisdictions, the kind of jurisdictional segregation that has produced a 98% minority school-aged population in Washington, D.C., and a 70% minority population in St. Louis and Los Angeles. The case of Los Angeles is particularly ominous because a decade ago, the city had a 14% minority

population. Today's 70% minority plurality developed through a combination of substantial minority in-migration and the exodus of 1,000,000 whites.[3]

Massive population shifts bring on their own difficulties. The social institutions and human relationships within neighborhoods that identify and aid people in difficulty, that help maintain respect for the community's laws, that help individuals succeed in establishing families and businesses, and obtaining an education--all are weakened and disruped; quite often they are lost.

The shifts are accompanied by significant changes in property values, great losses in capital investment, and in many communities substantial losses of housing stock and therefore in the utility of much of the public investment in the area. Because they have lost so many residents, communities find they have far too much investment in public faciliites and institutions, hospitals, schools, churches, even streets, telephone electrical, sewerage and water capacity.

The problem for all these services is much the same: The costs of providing the services to a smaller, poorer population increases dramatically. The poor need more social services, but generate fewer dollars to pay for them. The problem is quite dramatic for schools. When neighborhoods begin to decline, and especially when homes begin to disappear, the schools go through a cycle of change and decline. Typically, the school tries to weather the cycle and is maintained for a number of years by the school system as an underutilized, expensive facility. This happens partly because of the system's sheer inertia--and its inability to understand the change that has overtaken the community--and partly in response to neighborhood and other political leaders who are concerned that closing schools would both accelerate the neighborhood's decline and destroy any chance of reversing the process.[4] The school system also has a vested interest in keeping the neighborhood school open, in most cases, in bureaucratic self-interest. Closing a school reduces the overall size of the system, and therefore its budget and the flexibility of its administrators. If enough schools close, the system loses prestige. Further-

more, the loss of any school reduces the need for administrators, which lessens the opportunities for advancement throughout the system and eliminates the positions of several principals, assistant principals, supervisors and teachers, which will have ripple effects throughout the system as those with seniority move others out of their positions.[5]

Most often, however, systems that keep underutilized schools open in effect partially close the school--as in a South Bronx, where falling enrollment (due to the burn-out of the neighborhood) resulted in budget reductions so severe that all after-school activities were eliminated; the school could not afford to pay the janitor to keep the building open. By closing the building at 3:30, the school in effect required those teachers, who had been volunteering to work in the school after hours on community projects, to leave the area. The school's presence in the community was reduced precisely at the time that the neighborhood most needed help in its ability to resist the forces destroying it. The school acted as if what happened in the neighborhood was beyond its interest or control. Certainly, it was not beyond its interest, for the school now serves a neighborhood without residents and will close. Nor is it beyond the school's control, though it appears the school did not understand its own influence on the neighborhood, and it did not accept responsibility for it.

I. EDUCATION RESEARCH AND NON-EDUCATIONAL IMPACTS OF SCHOOLS

One reason the New York Board of Education missed the point in the South Bronx is that there is, with a few exceptions we will discuss in succeeding sections of this paper, no discussion of schools' effect on neighborhoods in education literature. The education research community has neglected the question for several reasons, which we should examine.

1. The research tends to be strongly in-ward looking, focusing on the school itself and what takes place within its walls. Concerns for the neighborhood, city, or county are concerns only in the context of the schools. Emphasis is on how the school is affected and how it can best chart a passage through the world that surrounds it.

2. The research tends to define schools as institutions that operate youth education programs and exclude almost all other activities. While there are great variations among schools of different systems and even within the same system, schools are the institutional and physical home of far more activities than the mere education of children. They are often service delivery centers for nutritional needs, health, adult education, recreation. They frequently function as town halls, sponsor community celebrations, and provide meeting facilities for community, religious, fraternal, and service organizations. In varying degrees, adults of the community often spend considerable time in schools, in non-classroom activities. Research has overlooked many of the aspects of schools which are not inwardly focused.

3. Research tends not to focus, systematically, on the individual schoolhouse as a unit of analysis. School systems are studied; at best, the system's schools may be directly sampled. Broad statistical descriptors of school-by-school variations in resources, programs, types of students, and qualifications of faculty are often examined, but not in a way that would encourage intensive study of the interrelations between each school and its neighborhood. Some individual schools are examined in relation to their neighborhoods, most often in a more journalistic analysis of a single issue affecting that neighborhood (like the outpouring of studies on the Oceanhill-Brownsville race integration local control issues), but the studies tend to focus on the political interaction between school and community, rather than on the impact of a school on its community. In most studies of school-community relationships, the unit of analysis is simply too large to permit evaluation of the school's impact on a neighborhood. To the extent that neighborhoods

are considered, they tend to be considered from the perspective of the central administration, as antagonists thwarting--or attempting to thwart, for their own reasons--the policies of the central board of education.

4. Finally, education research has virtually totally ignored private schools, especially their affects on their neighborhoods. The research tends to include private schools in certain types of studies, but most generally from the point of view of how the presence of private schools affects the policies or fortunes of public schools. Private schools are not viewed as neighborhood-level institutions, but they are to a far greater degree than most public schools. Private schools are not organized like the tightly structured, centrally controlled public school systems, and are far less institutionally constrained than public schools to restrict their activities to the affairs of children. Private schools, particularly in poor neighborhoods, tend to carry out programs directed at the needs of many other sectors of their community, as an adjunct--often a necessary adjunct--to their educational work. A private school may act as a community health agency, a family crisis intervention agency, a parks and recreation department, a center for the celebration of religious and patriotic feasts, and a kind of town hall. The poorer the neighborhoods, the more the private schools perform non-educational duties, with the schools in some inner-city neighborhoods running state employment training programs, community printing presses, drug rehabilitation centers, and other social service programs needed in the community.

II. COMMUNITY POLITICS AND SCHOOLS

The studies of the politics of communities reveal that elites, and other politically dominant groups, have an abiding interest in the control of the school.[6] Rarely do these studies find education issues central concerns of these political leaders, however. One set of studies finds the schools a channel for the development of elite leadership, like the Community Chest, or the JayCees. This suggests that the schools perform the political function of identifying, testing, and developing

political leadership, either within the informal elite governing structures or in the more public party-politics of the community. Another set of studies finds the schools host to the ideological conflicts (over social class, race, religion, and the place of business and labor) that mark the political life of the community. School board members and leaders of school organizations are often recruited for their ideological position, rather than their skills with school concerns. Other studies discuss more conventional forms of political organizational development fostered by public schools. This suggests that schools perform specifically political functions, having little to do with educational purposes.

A review of the more careful studies of the operation of school boards, or of the histories of school conflicts as they are reflected in school board behavior, will show evidence of substantial political activity taking place at the neighborhood level. The few who have studied the neighborhood-level politics of schools have found the involved groups to be principally groups organized around non-education issues or concerns.

All these studies give evidence that schools strongly affect communities in ways that have little to do with their educational program in any direct sense, but that are recognized and fought over by community groups.

In the 1920's, sociologists began to investigate the degree to which economic elites controlled the public life in cities and small towns, and to describe how that was accomplished. Initially, the control of the schools was only one of many local public activities found to be controlled by elites. Studies by the Lynds, Warner, and Hollingshead emphasized how the schools reflected the general political orientation of the elities.[7] Elites were shown to control the recruitment and selection of the public and administrative officials operating the schools, and to influence the professional, economic, and social advancement of these people.

In the late 1940s, sociologists like Floyd Hunter attempted to apply more rigourous empirical techniques to the question of control of public life.[8] Kimbrough applied the power structure methodology to the control of school systems by elites.[9]

In general, all these investigators were more interested in the linkages between economic elites and school leaders (in so far as they examined school politics) than they were with specific issues schools faced. They established the case for potential influence by the elite and the high probability that such influence did occur, but they did not focus on the influence as it was exerted on concrete matters.

These studies show that even in communities under the control of economic and social elites, the schools perform some valuable non-educational functions. Critics generally found the elite concerned about the level of school expenditure, which affected their own tax level, because they were major property owners. Repeatedly, school leadership positions--especially on the school board--were important to junior members of the elites seeking to rise within the social power system. In other words, the elites found school leadership exercise important training for other positions of leadership in the community. Even from this early literature, we find the idea that schools serve a political organizing function within their communities.

In the view of political scientists, like Robert Dahl, the sociological studies were insufficiently rigorous, committed to a thesis of elite dominance before the evidence was in, too little grounded in issues, and perhaps too focused on small, homogeneous communities.[10] Dahl, Polsby, and Wildavsky argued that to prove their thesis, the sociologists had to show that specific issues of local politics were consistently resolved to the benefit of the elites, especially those issues for which the elites showed great concern and unanimity.[11]

In his classic Who Governs?, Dahl looked at a number of government functions in New Haven, Connecticut, including schools. He found the principal issues in education to be related to the salary level of the teachers (which some regarded as a concern for professionalism in the schools) and to the construction of new facilities to relieve overcrowding.[12] Interestingly, Dahl found that an important

theme in New Haven politics was the schools as suppliers of jobs, perhaps because of the waves of immigrants who have entered the community in its long history.

Dahl found that the schools employed immigrants as service employees, such as janitors; that they employed the first generation of these families as teachers and the second-generation males as specialists and administrators.[13] He further found that the teaching staff was a major political resource for politicians who could mobilize it, because it provided a cadre of election workers in virtually every neighborhood of the city, a kind of alternative political party structure. Dahl found, in fact, that political reformers in the community sought out education issues--especially the promise of higher salaries and status for teachers--in order to get the teachers to work in the election campaign.[14]

The sociologists suggested that the schools were regarded as important objects of their political power, performing some function in the identification and maturation of community leaders. The political scientists found an overt political role in the schools, providing an alternative political organization with the manpower to challenge an existing political regime. The parallel to the political party was drawn in some detail, to the point where Dahl could observe that the schools provided the kind of middle-class jobs to maturing immigrant populations in much the same way that city political machines had done before.

Dahl observed that teachers, as they became organized into associations and unions, became a resource to political leaders attacking the established party organizations. Sayre and Kauffman and Theodore Lowi found that Dahl's New Haven observation was, if anything, even more true in New York City.[15] School personnel provided a kind of voluntary party organization that, Lowi observed, heralded the rise of the urban bureaucracies as independent and powerful political forces, replacing the urban political machine in important matters.[16]

In his attention to specific issues, Dahl suggests two more ways in which schools affect neighborhoods. In the period he studied, New Haven schools fought

two battles, in addition to the fight to increase teacher salaries. The first was over the appointment of a new assistant superintendent. The Italian community pressed for and won the appointment of an Italian school principal, the first Italian appointed to the higher administration in the system. The second fight was over the construction of a new school in an expanding section of the community. By definition, the neighborhood the school would serve was new, just in its formation stages, and consequently politically disorganized and weak. Because those controlling the school system represented the old neighborhoods, which would not benefit from the construction of the new school, they were reluctant to commit money to the project. The issue of the new school mobilized the community of newcomers, who eventually attained political prominence in the city.[17]

In the political issues that touched on education in New Haven, two themes connect schools to neighborhoods. First, the issues reflected the demands of certain ethnic groups or neighborhoods. And in New Haven, as in many other places, the two overlapped in territory and membership. The Italian assistant superintendent could have been regarded as a neighborhood representative as readily as a representative of Italians. His elevation would have recognized the rise in importance of the residents of the neighborhood he formerly served as principal of a school, as well as the increase in status of Italians in New Haven. Similarly, the fight over the construction of a new school was a neighborhood fight, in which a new neighborhood had to fight for recognition for its needs. Those leading this fight--and Dahl does not enter into detailed descriptions of the composition of these groups--appear to have been neighborhood groups, business groups, groups whose organizational focus was not education, but neighborhood.

Summerfield has also observed a strong neighborhood character to the politics of education. He finds that in a middle-sized community schools of the system differ widely in their resources, educational program, the stability or transiency of staff, and educational ethos or sense of accomplishement.[18]

Summerfield relates these differences to the social composition and organization of the neighborhoods the schools serve and differences in the style and degree of interaction between the school principal and neighborhood leaders. Summerfield concentrates on the neighborhood as a political resource for a principal in his struggles to obtain the greatest amount of self-control and self-definition from the central board and administration, and the attention from the central authorities needed to solve difficult or costly problems. In his account of a school in a racially-mixed neighborhood, whose principal made no effort to involve the community as political supporters of the schools, he documents the gradual disintegration of the school's morale and program and the subsequent difficulties in the neighborhood itself. He argues not only that the neighborhood affects the school's fortunes, but points out that the principal controls how the neighborhood interacts with the school. Summerfield suggests that the school may affect the neighborhood's fortunes as well.

In studies of the politics of school systems in Greenburg, New York, Teaneck, New Jersey, and Berkeley, California, I found a similar pattern of neighborhood focus.[19] Neighborhoods organized to protect their attendance areas, to gain more resources for their schools, to shape their own schools to their special desires without concern for the other schools of the system.

So strong was the neighborhood character of the Berkeley system in the 1950s that neighborhood schools (feeding into three different junior high schools) used different texts, followed different curriculums, and had widely different resources. The system was closer to a federation of unequals than to a centralized system. The politicizing movements of the 1960s, especially toward racial integration, altered this neighborhood character, at least temporarily. City-wide issues affecting all neighborhoods have become more important. Nevertheless, these studies confirmed a strong neighborhood base to the Berkeley school system's politics.

David Rogers, in his study of the integration battles in New York in the mid-1960s, recites a history of neighborhood-centered battles in which the most powerful neighborhoods were able to exempt themselves from integration plans. Plans involved the weakest of the white neighborhoods and the strongest of the black or hispanic neighborhoods.[20] Although he does not recognize it, Rogers finds in New York much the same pattern Summerfield found in his southern community: Schools were ranked according to their ability to receive benefits from the system and to protect themselves from trouble, which meant according to the political power of the neighborhoods they served.

In her study of the issues and movements shaping New York City schools, Diane Ravitch provides numerous examples of the neighborhood character of the politics of the that system in relatively recent periods.[21] She notes, for example, during the first wave of Jewish immigration at the turn of the century, Lower East Side Jewish neighborhoods got so crowded that the public schools were forced into half-day sessions. When the school system reassigned students to predominantly Irish public schools in nearby neighborhoods (so that the Jewish schools could return to full-day sessions), Jewish community leaders refused to permit the attendance area changes. They were concerned with the impact of the change on their community.[22]

Weeres, in his study of Chcago school politics at the neighborhood level, found that the groups most active in education affairs in the 32 communities had primary purposes not related to education. These groups were principally neighborhood oriented--block associations, social groups, business associations, and churches--and were concerned with the school's effect on the neighborhoods.[23]

Even though school bureaucracies in Chicago have not attained the independent, political role they have in New York, New Haven, and elsewhere, Peterson finds that the board of education must deal more with broad political issues and cleavages in the community, than with more narrowly educational issues.[24] The Chicago schools were an arena where broad social issues developed, another battleground

for fights begun elsewhere. The central Board of Education resisted formal decentralization of its power over budgets, curriculum and personnel policies. At the same time, however, it permitted extraordinary experiments with community-controlled decentralization, and it protected neighborhood interests in the schools. For example, the board supported the Elementary and Secondary Education Act Title III experiment involving the board, the University of Chicago, and Saul Alinsky's Woodlawn Organization. A community governing board composed of representatives of all three organizations oversaw a special curriculum, the reorganization of the school programs, and the hiring of special teachers from outside the system. Even the Board of Education's infamous Wilson Wagons of the 1960s (mobile homes used as classrooms, which many regarded as a means to avoid bussing) could be regarded (as Orfield suggested) as an attempt to maintain its policy of protecting neighborhoods.[25]

Peterson does not investigate the political activity surrounding neighborhood schools, except insofar as it attracts the attention of the central board. Nevertheless, his research does suggest the existence of what we might most appropriately term "pre-board politics." There is extensive political activity at the neighborhood level that generates support for a neighborhood's schools and resolves disputes involving the school or the neighborhood. The board becomes involved only when these matters cannot be settled at the neighborhood level, or when the board must make an appropriation for a special expenditure.[26]

These studies suggest that neighborhood residents believe they are affected by the actions or character of the public schools serving them. The groups that mobilize--and the concerns they raise--focus on non-educational aspects of the schools. They are not parent organizations, but quite often of community residents in fraternal, civil, block, or other business associations, or in parishes, synagogues, or other religious organizations. In the district school board elections in New York City, after the teachers union, the organizations placing the largest number of representatives on district boards are the community churches,

whose candidates focus on the neighborhood in their concerns with the schools. The prevalence of such groups in the neighborhood politics of education suggests their belief that local schools have a major impact on neighborhoods. Although none of these studies go into the nature of the non-educational support groups in great detail, it is likely that the concerns that attracted them to the schools issue are neighborhood bound, because educational issues would have encouraged the formation of organizations spanning neighborhood boundaries.

Summary: We have found no studies examining in detail the effects schools may have on neighborhoods, but we have found suggestions of a variety of types of effects in the literature: (1) the marked neighborhood politics in the schools; (2) schools' involvement in political issues that transcend education; (3) the use of schools, at both the neighborhood and central levels, to recruit, test, and season political leaders and political organizations; and (4) the political activity of the teaching bureaucracies and school support groups for candidates in the community, which in some communities has rivaled that of political parties. The net result is that political leaders look upon neighborhood groups organized around schools as political resources, and the neighborhoods themselves become more powerful.

But these studies present only a direction for future study. How important are schools to the physical development of communities? (Many community groups assume they are quite important.) How important are they to the social and political development of neighborhoods? Under which conditions are they likely to encourage strong social organization, and under which conditions are they likely to fail to have any organizing effects? How do schools affect the ethos of neighborhoods or the articulation of non-education issues?

III. SCHOOLS' EFFECTS ON NEIGHBORHOODS: TWO TYPES OF STUDIES

Ironically perhaps, although public school analysts have not directly addressed the question of schools' social impact on their neighborhoods, private school analysts have done so--and, indirectly, so have public school researchers studying the effect of school closings on communities. We'll take a look at the more direct analysis--private schools' effects on parishes--first, and then turn to the studies of school closings.

Private Schools' Effects on Neighborhoods: Private school researchers were forced to confront the question of schools' effects on neighborhoods for two reasons.

First, private school enrollments began to decline before public school enrollments did (1965 v. 1975), and the drop was much more severe (33% v. 2%)[27] The enrollment decline coincided with a period of crisis in the Catholic Church, which in 1965 enrolled over 90% of all private school students. The number of religious teachers had been falling for several years, as had the number of new entrants to religious orders. Following the Second Vatican Council, however, the number of religious teachers fell even more sharply. Also, post-Council, Catholic and non-Catholic critics challenged the very idea of an isolationist Catholic education. They argued that the church and its members would be better served by full participation in public schools and other public activities. When these critics raised questions about private education--questions virtually never asked about public education--private school analysts were forced to consider the full range of effects that parish schools have--including non-educational effects.[28]

Second, at least 80% of all private schools are affiliated with some church, with most elementary schools affiliated as parish schools. High schools typically serve associations of parishes, are themselves parish schools, or draw students from several or all parishes in a community. Thus, the natural focus of these schools is a group of people who meet regularly, share the same community-related

problem, and live in close proximity to one another.

Greeley, McCready and McCourt have argued that Catholic schools provided a necessary focus of parish life, that they were an enterprise of the parish that drew members together, reinforced parish interpersonal associations, encouraged greater voluntary contributions from parishioners, helped give the parish an identity, and defined it as a special community worthy of priority effort by its members.[29] In sum, the authors argued, the parish school had important effects on organization building and maintenance that were not captured by simply looking at the differences Catholic education made to the Catholic training of children.

To a degree, the study of the role of the parish school could be regarded as a discussion of the impact of schools on communities. In the extreme case, as Saunders has shown in Chicago, neighborhoods approach 80%-90% Catholic populations.[30] The norm is to attend the Catholic school. The organizing and community-building impacts of the operation of the school on the parish are indistinguishable from those impacts on the community, because, for all practical purposes, the parish and the neighborhood are identical. But even in this case, the discussion in the study is limited since its concern was not the secular development of the neighborhood, but the development of the religious parish.

But the study does provide an example of the kinds of questions that should be asked about public and private schools' impact on their neighborhoods. It encourages examination of the less-physical examples of impacts, not so much brick-and-mortar effects, but changes in the number, types, and purposes of community organizations, changes in the style of life in the community, and the degree to which community members work to reinforce one another.

The Greeley, McCready, McCourt study suggests that the school may be encouraging the development of a neighborhood society or reshaping what exists. It may be introducing families to one another, nurturing in them a sense of shared

interests that ultimately transcend the concern with education. The school may be directly forging a community among the children, who study and play together and who may choose their marriage partners from among their classmates, who may decide to stay in the neighborhood to raise their families or to move to new neighborhoods. The school may be developing a sense of neighborhood ethos, of how things are done in this neighborhood, whether for good (we help each other here; strangers are our guests) or ill (we kick out the poor). The school may be helping carry forward neighborhood family values, whether these be ethnic pride, concern for the survival of the traditional family, or just a way of speaking or expressing oneself.

All these, by analogy with the research of Greeley on parish schools, may be the hidden factors determining the success or failure of a neighborhood to work together and to cohere (insofar as success or failure is due to forces within the neighborhood itself). The Greeley study suggests many direct school impacts on neighborhoods, but there are many questions of secular development not raised in the study which should be asked. An analogous study of school effects on community development is called for. One aspect of their study is especially noteworthy: the social scientists note that it is not simply a question of either the school has beneficial effects or there is no school. There are different kinds of schools, operated differently with different effects. Any study of the community effects of schools should be aware and make provision for examining the range of possible types of school-community interactions.

Private School Effects on Families: It is reasonable to assume that if schools can have substantial effects on communities, especially in shaping relationships between community residents, that schools have great impact on families. Indeed, many parents supporting private schools believe this to be true, and some of the most respected academic critics of public education have argued that for public schools to be effective, they must counter the pathologies of families that hinder

the ability of children to absorb the education given them. We have been unable to identify studies investigating the effects of schools on families, apart from those attempting to show that higher educational attainments can change family class, or class characteristics such as family leaders or political positions on popular issues.

There are a number of articles concerned, at least generally, with the effects families have on schools, school support, the educational processes, or the ability of schools to develop high levels of achievement in students. But much of this discussion focuses on family characteristics beyond the family's control, such as socioeconomic status, primary language spoken at home, educational attainment of parents, or behavioral pathologies.

Two studies of Catholic schools conducted for the Office of Education and the National Institute of Education indicated that Catholic schools--especially inner-city Catholic schools--were remarkably effective in involving parents in the schools.[31] Other parish-based or low-tuition independent schools (e.g. alternative schools) are reported to have a similarly high rate of parent involvement. Morton suggests that this parental involvement may be responsible for the superior achievement of private school students, not directly--private school teachers do not work more under the parental gun than public--but subtly, through their ability to establish a tone within the school by their efforts for it.[32] Morton finds that successful schools develop a supportive morale, and that this ethos is remarkably similar in successful upper- and middle-income public schools and in private schools serving all income levels. But is is not present in the lower-income public schools in his sample, schools with students achieving substantially below the norms for their age cohorts. Public inner-city schools in Morton's sample (Rhode Island schools) were unable to develop the positive ethos, while private schools serving the same neighborhoods were.

Morton's evidence points to parental involvement as at least a correlate and perhaps a causative factor in student success. Catholic inner-city schools obtain parent involvement because the schools are projects of their parishes. They belong to, are formed and sustain by, and serve the local Catholic community. according to research on those schools.[33] Analogous research on Lutheran, Episcopal, Hebrew, Seventh Day Adventist, and other religiously affiliated schools has not been conducted. But research into the finance and organizational structure of most of those types of schools suggests that the Catholic experience is not unique.

The private religious schools have some advantages over public schools in dealing with the families in the typical lower-income community. Lower-income families enrolling children in Catholic inner-city schools are typically first or second-generation ethnics, racial minorities, or recent immigrants from rural areas. With the parish, the Catholic schools typically celebrate the rituals and events of the ethnic or minority community. For instance, a Mexican-American Catholic school usually celebrates Mexican national and religious holidays as well as parish feasts, such as the parish saint's name day.[34] Previous studies have found these parish schools to be highly integrated into the family and communal life of the neighborhood, in contradistiction to the public schools, which are usually staffed by teachers from outside the neighborhood who are foreign to the neighborhood's culture.[35] The religious life of an ethnic family and community is an important force for helping to create a sense of unity among its members.

The public school cannot enter as intimately into that life. It must transform religious celebrations into something secular to observe ethnic feasts. More often it will celebrate only American holidays. For these and other reasons, the public school weakens the base of family and social cohesion in the ethnic community and thus weakens the community's ability to control the political and economic forces that shape its growth or decline. From society's viewpoint, this weakening effect is desirable because the schools then integrate a foreign culture into the

mainstream of American life. From the viewpoint of the ethnic child and his or her community, however, such a school could be damaging.

One other significant argument has been made by the leaders of a black Chicago neighborhood about the Catholic school serving their community. The argument could be made, however, of any self-supported inner-city school, and has been made in recent years by Black Muslims of their schools, by CORE of the CORE community school, by Lutherans of their schools, and by others: By definition, the poor are powerless. Though they can sometimes obtain political power as organized groups, as individuals they remain powerless. To the poor who support private schools, the schools are examples of a way in which they are not powerless. The schools depend on their supporters for survival; they are the projects of the poor who pay for them.[35] Each "project" has the effect of reordering family priorities because the project is difficult and demands sacrifice. It demands that the family put education first, before other needs and pleasures, in the allocation of its money and time. The school as a project becomes an example of the power of the group, and simultaneously the cause of its developing power. This sense of "powerfulness" is carried over to other areas of community concern. It is also conveyed to children who attend the school, and it may be the reason for their superior academic achievement.

It is significant that most of the analysts who attempt to explain the superior performance of private inner-city schools over public--despite the similarity of their student bodies and the far superior resources of the public schools--suggests that the parents' relation to the school is important. But existing studies cannot be regarded as conclusive, either on the point that private schools do enjoy greater parental support among the lowest-income groups than do public, nor on the question of whether parental involvement is responsible for superior achievement of the students, nor on how this might occur if it does happen.

Existing studies do suggest some important and reasonable hypotheses, however.

1. The more a school is financially dependent on a neighborhood, the more it acts to alleviate non-educational problems of the neighborhood. Private schools appear to be more effective as community organizations than public schools and tend to give resources (attention and time) to correcting community problems that may only indirectly be causing students educational difficulties.

2. Private inner-city schools are typically financially marginal organizations; without parents' contributions of labor and tuition, the schools fail. Parents report they feel they are needed and respected by the private school's professional staff. They feel their help is critical and report more satisfaction and sense of efficacy in working with the private schools than with public schools. Parents may not be accurate in their perceptions of the relative need of public and private schools for their active participation, but their sense of efficacy increases the organizing potential of the private schools as community organizations.

The observation of an increased sense of efficacy is predicted by the management theory of "undermanning": Understaffed organizations are more efficient because workers find satisfaction in being critically needed and in seeing that their work makes a clear and measurable contribution to the success of the enterprise. When an organizations is fully staffed, an individual's importance and job satisfaction declines. (For schools, this implies that the closer they come to financial solvency, the more difficult it will be to obtain the contributed efforts needed to sustain both their academic and community organizing accomplishments.) Private schools may have an advantage over public in involving powerful community groups simply because of their greater financial need.

3. The inner-city private schools reinforce the family's view of the importance of education. Because they mobilize parents so effectively and give parents evidence of the effectiveness of their own efforts, these schools raise

the importance of education in the hierarchy of activities to which a family gives its energies. Families tend to regard as more important activities that consume more time. In this way, the schools directly change the families. The phenomenon occurs in all tuition-charging schools (at least if theories of consumer psychology are correct) and is likely to be strongest in schools serving lower-income families for whom tuition charges are a significant portion of disposable income. There are two reasons why parental attitudes can be expected to change: First, the schools educate the parents about what they are doing and what their needs are, so that parents are willing to give support and pay higher tuitions when that is necessary. Tax-supported schools--particularly those whose budgets have been made relatively immune to voter revolts through the various election devices of the Reform movement designed to remove the schools from "politics"--have less need to educate parents. This is especially true for schools in the inner-city or other low voter turnout communities. Furthermore, it does public schools less good to convince their parents to give higher support, because the balance on any public issue over increased support is in the hands of those who do not have children in the public schools, in most communities. Thus the private schools can make a more concentrated effort, and adopt approaches more likely to change the attitudes of parents sending their children to the schools. The public schools must concentrate on those not directly connected to the schools.

Second, the very burden tuition places on low-income families has the effect of making education more important in the family's eyes. The costs of education are great in relation to family income; parents must forego activities, possessions and pleasures they could enjoy were they not required to pay tuition. Necessarily, if the tuition is to be paid and the family's income low, education must rise on the scale of budget priorities. The choices are more costly for the lower income family; the tuition forecloses a greater proportion of the family's alternative ways of allocating its income.

4. Because private schools are products of parents' and teachers' efforts--not the result of some unearned beneficence from outside the community--they create a sense of pride in the students and parents. This pride can often be translated into a supportive attitude toward the community. (Public schools--especially those in small towns--may also develop this sense of pride, and may have comparable community-building benefits, encouraging the students and their families to identify with the neighborhood or community whose residents attend the schools.)

Some critics claim that private schools weaken the public by attracting the community's most educationally interested and committed families. While there are disputes about the facts--is it true that the private schools enroll only the most ambitious of the parents in the community, leaving public schools with the uninterested?--if the schools do operate as suggested, they should attract and retain in the community the most successful, and therefore most mobile, members. Parents who switch children from one school to another normally conceive a reason to leave one school before searching out the qualities of alternatives. If the private schools do function as the critics fear, they are beneficial to the prospects of the neighborhood. They help create a demand for its homes and indirectly therefore help sustain property values and encourage reinvestment; they help identify people who are willing to work for the betterment of the communities, they pinpoint problems driving people from the area, and they provide an area where groups can meet to confront neighborhood problems. They offer the community a professional staff that has a stake in the survival of a specific school in a specific neighborhood--in contrast to the public school whose staff is tenured to the school system, and retain their positions even if their neighborhood school closes. Furthermore, the private school is dependent on its neighborhood support; if it loses that support it fails. The public schools cannot fail for lack of neighborhood financial support; it fails only if the neighborhood disappears.

The Effect of Closing Public Schools on Communities

Since World War II, there have been three sets of opportunities to restudy the relationship between school and community by observing the changes that take place when schools close. The first, the rural consolidation movement, closed thousands of small schoolhouses in rural communities and replaced them with large regional or county schools. Educators believed the larger schools would be more efficient and would offer more appropriate vocational preparation than the small schools. These closings attracted a small but influential group of researchers, who examined both the underlying assumptions of the consolidation theory and the practical consequences of consolidation for communities that lost their schools.

Research has shown not only that the expected economies of consolidation do not operate, but that the labor-intensive nature of the educational institution causes diseconomies of scale--without even calculating the costs of student commuting time.[36] A number of studies have found that the school closings had a major impact on rural community's identifying institutions--the others being the closing of the railroad station, the highway by-pass, and the closing of the post office.

Peshkin's study of a rural community which rejected consultant's proposals that its high school be consolidated with several others in a midwestern farming area identifies a number of roles the school played (or the townspeople believed the school played) in the community, such as: (1) developing the relationships among townspeople that have helped the community remain important and vital (three generations of Mansfieldians went to the same school); (2) bringing the community together (quite literally as well as figuratively); (3) creating a sense that this town is special, different from the other shopping areas nearby.[37] Peshkin points out that the school's sports teams, fund-raising events, and participation in celebrations and display of talents of the town youth all enhance the community-building. Peshkin also notes that the argument of fiscal efficiency is not germane to the town, if teachers in the consolidated and more efficient school will live

in some other community, where they will be taxed and spend their incomes. The teachers and administrators and school programs are a form of cultural wealth to the community as well. Mansfield would lose both economic and cultural resources in losing the school, and this in turn could affect the decisions of other residents to remain in town and, perhaps even more importantly, the decisions of potential residents or businesses seeking to locate in the area to locate elsewhere. Townspeople felt a sense of control and determination over their school that Peshkin felt would be lost if the school were moved to another community. And parents could not have as much guidance over the social interactions of their children, would not know the families (and therefore the problems of the families) of their children's new friends.

Peshkin's study suggests a number of lines of analysis to be followed when considering the impact of schools on neighborhoods. Particularly important is his emphasis on the role of the school in fostering a sense of identify and community among the townspeople. However, this role may not be precisely translatable to the urban neighborhood. Rural communities have a much greater sense of autonomy than do most city neighborhoods. Rural towns' sense of separateness from other communities is reinforced by physical distances, social distance in relationships, and their own self-government. Peshkin's observations about the rural communities do not necessarily fit the urban circumstance. His line of analysis is extremely provocative, however. In the urban situation, analysts would have to modify his methodology to define the role of the school in developing a sense of community, as well as in defining the importance of a sense of community to the survival and growth (or maintenance) of urban neighborhoods.

Vidich and Bensman, in their classic anthropological study of the changing economic circumstances of a small town in New York State, found that rural consolidation wiped out the identity of four separate "neighborhood" communities in the rural area.[38] Consolidation shifted control of the schools to regional economic

elites; the consolidated school developed a business curriculum that directed students to careers away from the area and--in the eyes of the farmers in the old "neighborhoods"--weakened the family basis of farming. By analogy, neighborhood schools that respond to the special ethnic characteristics of their neighborhood and reinforce family strengths may be contrasted to more centrally-directed schools that fail to adopt reinforcing policies and programs.

However, Vidich and Bensman's study does not evaluate the effects on the neighborhood communities of their loss of control over their local schools. The study notes: the programmatic change in the schools and its obvious career effects on the students; the loss of political voice in the old neighborhoods and the beginning neglect of public facilities in the neighborhood areas as possibly related to this loss in voice; the capture of the schools by the new and emerging economic dominants, and suggests their efforts to operate the schools in a manner that best serves their own economic interests (which includes their willingness to trade some business patronage available in the local schools' supply accounts, and to offer some economic protectionism against competition in the sales of candy and other consumer items children purchase arising on the school campus, in return for support from the declining business leadership of the old town). The study, however, cannot connect the neighborhoods' decline simply to the closing of the schools, nor can it identify how much of the decline was caused by school closing. It does not, in the end, discuss the ecological change in the community that school consolidation may have induced.

The second post-war movement providing an opportunity to investigate the impact of schools on communities has been the court-ordered integration of public schools. Analysts of school integration conventionally distinguish between desegregation plans designed to overcome de jure and de facto segregation. Legal reasoning and case history of the late 1960s and early 1970s have blurred the distinction between the two, but clarifying the original meaning is useful for our discussion.

Through de jure segregation, the states, by law, established a second system of schools for blacks which overlay the system of white schools. Residential patterns in these communities, however, tended to be formally integrated: Whites lived in the corner houses and on the main streets, blacks in between or on the side streets and alleys.[39] The striking down of segregation laws had the effect of reunifying existing neighborhoods.

De facto segregation referred to a segregation that resulted from the housing choice patterns of blacks and whites in urban areas. Schools became segregated because their neighborhoods were segregated. Eliminating this factual segregation requires the changing of the attendance areas of neighborhood schools, either by closing some schools and redistributing their students, or by shifting attendance borders to capture the right racial mixtures in the underlying potential-student residential population, or by busing between districts--which could best be described as scatter-site attendance districting. Any of these efforts to overcome de facto segregation in effect breaks the linkage between elementary and high schools and the neighborhoods they formerly served, quite often scattering students from one neighborhood among many schools in the system.

There have been few investigations of the neighborhood effects of this reorganization, virtually no questioning of how and to what degree the reassignment of students may have disrupted neighborhoods, and therefore no development of any understanding of whether and how neighborhood disruption has contributed to or frustrated integration effort. James Coleman argues that integration efforts may have had precisely this effect--encouraging white flight and frustrating their own objective.[40] Others dispute Coleman's statistical analysis. The question calls for much more careful examination of the mechanisms of this "white flight." It is particularly important that neighborhoods with formerly integrated schools, which were stable during the initial period of integration, but later destabilized when district boundaries were altered, be examined.

The redistricting of a neighborhood school is similar to the consolidation of rural schools, but the rural families do not have the chance to remove their children from the consolidating system.* While rural schools may be more important cohesive factors in their communities than neighborhood schools in cities--and that is not certain--the consequences of their closing may be less severe, simply because the existing social relationships already fostered by the schools will continue in the rural communities, where families are not mobile. But in the city, the closing of the school (or the redistricting of the neighborhood) could mean a relatively sudden movement of families from the area.

Coleman's analysis suggests that either integration itself, or the disruption that specific integration plans cause, encourages families to leave the community. The literature we have reviewed suggests that the schools may have fostered neighborhood organizations and social interactions that established a positive attitude toward the community in the minds of its residents and that could effectively resolve problems the community faced. If this is the case, then the disruption of the school attendance area may also disrupt the social organization people find responsible for the quality of life in the community they find attractive. In other words, the flight Coleman finds operating may be the result, not of integration itself, but of the changes in the school-community relationships that accompanied specific integration plans. This is clearly an important question. Some evidence does suggest that the integration plan may affect the political cohesiveness of community groups, does affect the political voice of minority and majority groups, and can account for varying degrees of confrontation and acceptance, even at the same degree of physical integration. Once again, evidence suggests the importance of more attention to the school-community interactions and relationships.

---

*The notable exceptions are the Amish and Mennonites in Pennsylvania, Wisconsin, Iowa, and a few other states, where the families were given permission to continue their one-room school houses as private schools, or to establish alternative credit-granting courses of study on their own farms, or to terminate their children's education at an age earlier than was mandated by the state.

The third opportunity has resulted from the combination of suburban migration of city residents, which has resulted in the depopulation of some neighborhoods, the falling birth rate of the American family following the period of the "baby boom" which has resulted in a substantial overcapacity of elementary and secondary schools, and the desire to integrate urban schools, which often makes a virtue of the overcapacity by closing down minority-impacted schools and distributing those students across other schools in the system as part of an integration plan.

No studies of the closing of urban schools can be regarded as completely successful. In general, studies have a difficulty distinguishing effects of the schools from broader trends affecting the neighborhood and its school. None have satisfactorialy accounted for the mechanisms by which urban schools influence their communities. The existing studies will be discussed in section V.

SECTION IV: THE HOUSING MARKET AS AN INDICATOR OF SCHOOL IMPACT ON NEIGHBORHOODS

Coleman's argument about white flight resegregating central school systems trying to integrate suggests (as did the real estate brokers and the federal courts mentioned at the beginning of this discussion) another impact of schools on communities: Schools shape the socioeconomic characteristics of their neighborhoods. Recently, social scientists have reexamined some of the insights of the political economists including the fact that public schools, like other public goods, are chosen by families moving about the metropolitan area, selecting homesites on the basis of the mix of public goods, private amenities, and the costs that accompany them. This means that a form of market control and response affects both public schools and their communities.

By establishing and participating in this market, schools make some neighborhoods powerful--those with the greatest aggregate market force--and others impotent, those whose residents have low incomes and little ability to make market demands. Consequently, schools may cast over a neighborhood a sense of political powerfulness or powerlessness, independent of any formal mechanisms for governance that they may offer neighborhood residents. The school's effect on the socioeconomic characteristics of its neighborhood is strongly influenced by existing public policies, especially taxation policy. Unfortunately the direction of influence is regressive: Existing policies magnify the tendencies of schools to produce economic and, derivatively, racial and ethnic segregation.[41]

Most studies dealing with white flight concentrate on entire cities, rather than neighborhoods. But for our purposes of examining the dynamic of white flight--and the role schools play in this process--the rather gross statistics and patterns are adequate.

Between 1970 and 1975, New York City lost 15.3% of its intact white families, an average loss of 9,000 families per year.[42] Most families flee to the suburbs when their children are five to fourteen years old, according to Bins and Townsel,

who analyzed the patterns of outmigration affecting the increasing presence of minority students in the 26 largest school systems in the country.[43] They found "the decision about where to live by parents in their late twenties and early thirties (is)...a prime determinant of the racial and socioeconomic composition of central cities and suburbs." Their conclusion, that out-migration is related to the school age of children, has also been reported in research by Long and Glick, among others.[44]

New York City is not alone in losing white families. The Bureau of the Census reports that during the 1970s Los Angeles's proportion of minorities grew from 14.5% to 70%, and that a major factor in this shift was the outmigration of 1,000,000 whites. This movement is even more extraordinary because it has occurred in the largest city in the nation, with an area of 464 square miles compared to New York's 300 square miles. The 1970-1980 data is not available for most cities, but we can reasonably assume that the pattern established for the 1960-1970 period has not been reversed. In that period, central cities in the Northeast lost 16.2% of their white families to the suburbs, almost twice the national rate.[45] Sociologist William Frey argues that "the most damaging aspect of this flight, from the perspective of the city's economic viability, is not the out-movement of whites per se, but the loss of the city's upper-status, high-income population--a subgroup which tends to be overwhelmingly white."[46] Frey could, as well, have spoken of the economic impact on neighborhoods of this outmigration: the changes in the housing economies of neighborhoods, numbers of commercial and manufacturing businesses, and deposits in local banks available for community reinvestment.

In the older Northeast cities in Frey's study, he found that 30%-40% of high-status whites moved to the suburbs in the 1965-1970 period alone. In a factor analysis of the determinants of these moves, Frey finds that the highest-status, highest-income families were motivated particularly by relatively higher

levels of per pupil expenditures in suburban school districts. Either these families put more emphasis on education than lower-income families, or their higher income gave them the means to move in pursuit of better quality education for their children. Federal and state income taxation policy has magnified the economic advantages of the wealthy to leave for the suburban schools. (We will discuss this complicated argument fully at the end of this section.)

In a similar study, Janet Pack uncovered an additional factor motivating high-status families to relocate.[47] Along with education, Pack found tax considerations of particular importance to a family's decision to leave the city. Pack's research focused on property taxes, which are especially concerned with education in the suburban areas, but which are much less significant (because relatively invariable once established for a piece of property) than income taxes in motivating behavior.

Crocker, in an early study of the effects of urban air pollution on housing values (in Chicago) found that the quality of the public school, according to the annual rankings of the Board of Education (which varied somewhat with socioeconomic characteristics of the neighborhood) was a significant independent variable predicting a constant portion of housing price. If all other factors held constant, the quality of the school drove housing prices up or down.[48]

Frey attempted to go behind the market value of the house to determine how much schools actually influenced families to leave on neighborhood for another. How directly, in other words, do schools affect the decline of one neighborhood by encouraging families to leave and the growth of another by attracting new families. Frey found that the decision to leave the city for a suburban home is typically made in two steps. First, the family decides it needs new quarters. Most urban families make this decision several times in their life cycle.

When the family is first formed, it needs only small quarters, sufficient to house two people. Usually after the second child, however, or when the first child

reaches school age, the family will seek larger quarters. Simultaneously, the family income should be increasing. As the principal wage earners become established in their jobs, the family finds itself able to afford larger housing while devoting the same or even a smaller proportion of its income to education. If the family continues to grow, or its income increases substantially again, it may move once more into the kind of house that will serve the family until the children have left home and the parents retire. Then the family is likely to seek smaller, less expensive housing.[49]

On average, American families changed residences every five years. Frey does not find unhappiness with the local schools to be a major reason families seek new housing, but that, of course, may understate the potential for schools to influence decisions to leave. We must presume that parents do not locate in neighborhoods with totally unacceptable schools if they have any prospects of using public schools. (Indeed, the second half of Frey's model of family house-choice behavior suggests that families relocate with just the quality of the schools in mind, so they should not end up in communities with totally unacceptable schools unless they have no effective choice of housing location, or unless some substantial and sudden change has taken place in the school system.)

In the second stage of the decision, after deciding that it must leave, the family will decide upon a new location. "The choice of destination location... involves the comparison of amenities and disamenities associated with different prospective communities." Frey's multivariate analysis of ten "demographic or policy relevant factors"--including racial and school expenditure data--classifies families into six socioeconomic groups, each behaving in a slightly different way. If per pupil expenditure is a measure of school quality, Frey found that the "quality" of the schools was a more important determinant of the new housing location for the highest-status group than for any of the other five statuses. He also found that the proportion black of the school district was more important to

the highest-status whites than to any other white socioeconomic group. In contrast, the racial composition of the central city was a significantly less important determinant of the decision to relocate outside the city for the lower-status white groups, and least important of all for those who failed to graduate from high school.

Frey's study suggests some important integrating forces at work in lower-status city neighborhoods--which are disproportionately ethnic in character. From other data, we know that urban ethnic communities are disproportionately served by private schools. Other data suggests that the public schools in the more established ethnic areas accommodate themselves to the ethnic community as well. We can speculate that the propensity of lower-status whites to remain in the city, in proximity to minorities--a propensity Frey finds to be at least partially independent of family income and therefore a result of family preference rather than inability to move--may be related to how the urban public and private schools reinforce neighborhood social and political institutions, social structures, and values. The question, while obviously difficult to research because of the difficulty of quantification, has central importance.

An alternative, and potentially complementary explanation, is that both upper- and lower-income families maximize certain values in their choice of schools. Upper-income families seek out those school qualities that can be measured by dollar allocations; that lower-income families, which should be disproportionately ethnic in their characteristics, seek values either incompatible with, or simply not measured by, the highest levels of school per pupil expenditure. In this analysis, both sets of schools--higher-spending and lower-spending schools--can and do attract families to their neighborhoods. The obvious difficulty with the argument is that it ignores the possibility that the lower-status families are simply priced-out of the highest-spending schools. This may, in fact, occur. But we should not assume, without careful examination, that even if it is occurring, it is all that is occuring. Given free access, families will not necessarily always choose the

highest-spending schools. The variety of tuitions among the private schools attracting the highest-income families (and the fact that 75% of high-income families choose public schools) indicates strongly that families also choose schools for reasons not measured by expenditure.[50]

If a family's demand for a school (as in "consumer demand") affects the market value of the house, then those who control the schools--if they are interested in keeping property values high (as most political leaders are)-- should respond in a market fashion, by shaping the schools to appeal to the wealthiest consumer market available to them. (Similarly and more directly, private school trustees or directors of schools whose incomes are directly related to consumer demand, will attempt to shape their policies to maintain the levels of their planned enrollments.) Thus, there is a kind of consumer sovereignty even in the provision of public services like education.

William Boyd, in a perceptive discussion of the conflicts and benefits that surround the "polycentric system already in place in most metropolitan areas," argues that there is an imperfection in the operation of the market of providers of public goods that works to the disadvantage of the urban resident and ultimately of the central cities.[51] (And this imperfection is different from the important criticism of this market model, that the power of the consumer--and therefore the citizen's ability to be heard and receive a response or to obtain demands by going elsewhere--is limited by the citizen's wealth, and therefore is distributed unequally.) Boyd points out the theory of a beneficial polycentric market is based upon Tiebout's theory that when there is "a large number of local political units to pick from, each with its own special package of public goods and services, ...citizens can 'vote with their fee' and select the package most in accord with their preferences."[52] According to the theory, because of citizen mobility, the competition among jurisdictions for desirable residents and commerce produces (or is expected to produce) more efficient, consumer-sensitive delivery of public

services. The polycentric system of provision of services in metropolitan areas should be encouraged.

Boyd finds a serious flaw with this theory as it applies to urban governments: The urban school system behaves like a monopoly. He cites Michaelsen and Niskanen's arguments that in the urban system, technical proficiency has replaced consumer utility as the guiding principle of the schools.[53] The large system budgets are independent of the need for satisfied consumers; their needs to increase their tax-funded budgets often do not jibe with consumer needs. For example, budget increases are more likely through cutting services "where it hurts the clients," rather than in maintaining existing levels of services or cutting back in less painful areas. These systems may find the possibility of consumer exit--families moving to private schools or the suburbs--not threatening, but comforting. The system is relieved of the need to change its ways. In fact, some systems deliberately ignore citizen complaints in the hope of driving complainers out of the system. Ironically, federal programs to aid the problems of lower-income students may have increased the resistance of urban systems to the needs of those who can exercise the "exit option. Boyd reviews Porter's finding that school systems direct their best administrative talent to the tasks most likely to increase their budgets, and cities--pressed by increased costs for delivering services and declines in tax revenues--direct their energies to seeking federal and state grants. Suburbs, on the other hand, especially in the higher-income areas, find their best chance through increases in local tax budgets for schools so they direct their best talent to working with commmunity leaders, building up local support for the schools. This, of course, encourages the schools to listen to what parents want and even to anticipate their desires.[54]

Boyd concludes that the system of choice among public schools that produces a high level of satisfaction in the suburbs is unlikely to be as effective in the city. Urban schools are more resistant to accommodating themselves to their neighborhoods, because they are monopolistic and because they are more often guided by

the reform movements universalistic and technocratic principles directing "egalitarian" distributions of benefits than response to vocal, local demands.

There is, no doubt, less accommodation of neighborhood needs in urban areas than might optimally take place. However, there is evidence that the case for the egalitarian character of the urban districts is also overstated. As noted earlier, the substantial differences among urban schools within the same system produce market differences in housing values. Housing prices in the attendance district of New York City's P.S. 6 are higher than similar apartments in adjacent attendance districts, even within the same general neighborhood. Realtors attribute the difference to the effect of the school alone.

Urban public schools do not behave as inflexibly as the theory suggests they should because they are not the full monopolies the theory predicates. Private schools, especially parish schools, moderate the predicted indifference of the public school to its neighborhood in two ways:

1. Private schools act as competitors to the public quite successfully in some neighborhoods. Some parish schools are the prime school of attendance for their neighborhoods, enrolling 80% or more of all school-aged students.[55] In these neighborhoods in particular, public schools have been observed to respond energetically to the commmunity's wishes and to have a quite different character from other public schools in the same system.[56] These responsive public schools behave much as if <u>they</u> were the alternative schools seeking to attract enrollment from the private schools--which is a reasonable description of their situation. Thus the private schools can encourage the public schools to behave in ways that satisfy the parents and help anchor them in the neighborhood.

2. Private schools themselves attract and hold families in the neighborhood. They thus shape its population, and affect the population of the public school itself, and its support and competitive position vis-a-vis other public schools in the system or the area.

Research among public schools of the same system on the differences that account for their variable ability to attract parent-clients, and on the effect of private schools on their own neighborhoods and consequently on public schools, is in its beginning stages at best.

SECTION V. THE DESIGN OF STUDIES OF THE IMPACT OF SCHOOLS ON NEIGHBORHOODS

The education literature suggests that the schools play a number of roles in neighborhoods, which can be divided into six more or less discrete categories:

1. Schools attract to or repell from neighborhoods families with pre-school or school-aged children. They may therefore affect the socioeconomic characteristics of those who enter or remain in the neighborhood. Schools affect the market demand for housing in neighborhoods, and therefore affect the pricing of housing (or the technical terms of the literature, housing rents.)

2. Schools provide an arena and a reason for the social organization of families and parents in the community. With varying degrees of deliberation, they foster the organization of articulate groups based in the neighborhood. These organizations may be informal, growing out of the patterns of association among students in the school which eventually affect their families, to formal organizations like parents associations. These organizations can then become involved in non-school affairs of the neighborhood, ultimately affecting the stability or attractiveness of the community either through the direct benefits they offer their members or through their work on community problems.

3. Schools may directly affect the neighborhood's economic activity by employing neighborhood residents and buying from local stores. Schools may therefore indirectly subsidize neighborhood workers: school employees who contribute their out-of-school time to working on neighborhood problems. Parochial schools, especially those that provide housing for teachers on the school site, normally perform this function. Rural schools may provide a particularly clear example of the direct

economic benefits of schools, since their teachers typically live near the school, buy supplies and services from local businesses, and deposit tax revenues and other income in local banks--thus increasing the capital available for investment in the community. (Urban private schools, but not urban public schools, normally perform similar services for their neighborhoods.) From an economic standpoint, the schools are the largest business activity in most neighborhoods and in many larger communities. Their economic impact on the community is necessarily related to the capacity of the neighborhood to absorb the activity--on its supply of potential teachers, vendors, banks, and other suppliers of goods and services that schools need.

4. Schools may affect neighborhoods' political strength. Schools present issues that draw the focus of many neighborhood organizations, and give them a cause that often helps units the community, and present a common fact to the broader political community. In cities the reputation for political organization and strength earned by neighborhood groups in the struggle to support and guide the community schools affects leader's perceptions of the level of the neighborhood's general political strength. Because they are one of the broadest-membership groups in the community, school organizations can be mobilized to support political leaders in the community. A school often raises issues that identify local neighborhood leaders, provide the initial testing ground for them to develop their political talents, and ease their introduction into community-wide politics. School teachers may also become political forces in their own right, through their ability to recruit campaign workers among teachers who live in the community and through their ability to collect significant amounts of campaign contributions from their members.

School policies can frame political issues that affect the general political life of the community.

5. Schools can affect the neighborhood residents' attitudes about the neighborhood and its future. They can affect the sense of pride in the neighborhood and its members' sense of the neighborhood's relationship to other neighborhoods or, in rural areas, to other towns. Particularly effective in this regard are sports teams and musical and other performing groups which permit the members of the neighborhood to display their abilities to outsiders, and compete with other neighborhoods. The school's ability to form the attitudes of residents of a neighborhood can help determine satisfaction with residence in the neighborhood and the stability and future support of the neighborhood.

Previous research

In recent years, NIE has sponsored two research projects that tried to investigate the degree to which schools shape communities: one by the Seattle, Washington Public Schools and the other by the National Center for Urban Ethnic Affairs.[57] Neither study could be regarded as successful. Both suffered from problems of desi implementation that are especially difficult in studies of neighborhood s impacts--problems a successful design must overcome.

Both studies used closing schools as an event upon which to build an analysis of the impact of schools on neighborhoods. Conceptually, the studies assumed that the impact of the schools would disappear when the schools were closed, and the change would be reflected in various attitudinal changes in the residents, in rates of turnover of housing, and in housing price trends for the neighborhood. Both studies examined the possibility that the schools had effects on the social organization of the community, or were in other ways important to the neighborhood, but neither study was able to examine "organizational effects" in a useful, systematic fashion.

The case studies prepared by community groups for the National Center for Urban Ethnic Affairs (NCUEA) developed anecdotal data that was rich in its suggestiveness of how the schools influenced the community, but that could neither be subjected

to rigorous testing nor compared readily by school site. The quantified approach of the Seattle, Washington Public Schools based its analysis almost exclusively on the level of use of school buildings by outside groups, a relatively unsubtle indicator of organizational effects, which was made even less useful by a circumstance of the Seattle study where only one of the closing elementary schools actually ceased functioning as a school. The other four schools listed as closed in fact transformed themselves into magnet schools, junior high schools, or community colleges.

In both studies, the focus on the closing of the school as the critical event put constraints on the questions asked about school impacts and limited the effectiveness of the study. The "school closing" suggested to both sets of interviewers a pre- and post-event study, but in both cases the reviewers were studying the issue either prospectively or retrospectively, but from a single time-point. In the Seattle case, the study began five to eleven years after the schools had closed. And there were no existing, contemporaneous accounts of what the neighborhoods were like: how they were organized, which issues were important to the community, which parents were involved in the school and with what spill-over effects, for example. So it was not possible to define precisely the changes that occurred as a result of the school transformations or closings.

The NCUEA studies of school closings in ethnic neighborhoods also faced the difficulty of evidence of impact. In most cases the school closings were too close to the study date to permit an analysis of the organization and housing market impacts with any degree of sophistication.

Both studies had difficulty defining the neighborhood territory and clearly relating changes in the neighborhood to the closing of schools. Both paid attention only to the public school or only to the private school in the community; few of the cases account for the presence of both types of schools, although certainly the presence of a sister school would blunt the impact on the housing market and similar economic changes that were the primary indices of community change employed

in both studies. The NCUEA studies did include concerns about the closing of private schools in their case studies; the Seattle study made no mention of private schools.

The NCUEA case studies, in some examples, set the problems of the neighborhood in a developmental context, which is a necessary frame for understanding the incremental impact the continuation or elimination of a school has. In no case is the argument that a neighborhood cannot survive without a school. Rather it is that the neighborhood school can have an effect on the community, beneficial or deliterious--a variable effect--depending on personal and institutionalized school and community factors. Discovering the effect of the closing of a school requires a recognition of the trend of development in the neighborhood and a determination that the closing of the school altered that course. The NCUEA study examined the general developmental trends of the neighborhood, but was unable to define the effect of the schools on those trends. The Seattle schools study failed to establish the trends affecting the neighborhoods, and so was unable to determine the impact of the school closings, such as they were.

Both studies, but especially the Seattle study, attempted to define impact by changes in the housing market in the affected communities. The study did not control for changes in the national and regional pricing of housing during the period--changes that could have masked changes in the neighborhood market. The study design attempted to finesse the problem by identifying control neighborhood--neighborhoods similar to those with the closing schools, but whose schools remained open. To the extent that both sets of neighborhoods were affected by the same regional housing market trends, the impact of those extra-neighborhood generated fluctuations was regarded as held constant. However, the study encountered difficulty in identifying precisely similar control neighborhoods. A complicating factor was the fact that the control neighborhoods--because they were similar to the target neighborhoods--may have become recipients of families seeking alternative housing because of the school closing.

The most important difficulty is that the study of school closings becomes the study of an event, and forecloses the study of the system of relationships that surround the school. And the study of the schools' impact on the local housing market, which was the test of the impact of the closing in the Seattle cases, cannot be carried out if it excludes the impact of private schools on neighborhood residence. The impact of the two types of schools in a neighborhood is not necessarily simply additive. The demand of parents of children attending a public school which will be closed is not necessarily terminated in the neighborhood. The parents could remain in the neighborhood and send their children to the private schools.

Research design

From both the literature and the previous studies of the impact of schools on neighborhoods, we can formulate some useful guidelines for the design of research:

1. The object of the research is to determine whether and how school's affect their neighborhood's life. The focus of the study is not the school, but the neighborhood, and the changes the school brings about in its development.

2. The research should include both public and private schools--all schools which serve neighborhoods. Potentially, the relationship between school and neighborhood will be clearest for private schools, especially in inner-city and ethnic neighborhoods. There are several reasons for this.

First, most simply put, private neighborhood schools are parish schools; they belong to organizations that are among the most important and potentially powerful organizations of residents or urban neighborhoods. Parishes are focused on their neighborhoods like few other community organizations. In the best organized and most powerful parishes (or, of course, of synagogues), community residents meet at least weekly. Parishes provide the setting and often the leadership for discussion of neighborhood problems. The parish is connected to the neighborhood in a way that few public schools can be. It has to be because members of the

in a way that few public schools can be. It has to be because members of the parish--or school users--support the schools themselves.

Second, the private schools are particularly important to emerging ethnic communities.[58] Femminella has observed that there is a tension between the style of the American public school and the educational traditions of many immigrant cultures. This tension ultimately lowers the chances of an immigrant's attaining academic success while it also places his own culture, traditions, family, and social structure under a strain. As immigrant groups have become established (after the first waves of immigration), they have typically established their own schools--to help overcome these tensions. Quite often they have staffed their private schools either with members of their own community (as the Amish, Greek Orthodox, or Jews do) or with teachers brought from the mother country.

Mexican-American parishes in the Southwest today have begun to draw teachers from convents as far away as Mexico City; Filipino parishes in San Francisco and Honolulu have brought teaching sisters from the Philippines. These ethnic parish schools support the language, traditions, celebrations, and social relationships of the families in the ethnic community. They also assign to parents an important role in supporting and working for the school that new arrivals would not have had in the public system. Finally, to the immigrant, the fact that the parish school is not a government school is important, for the immigrant is not a powerful actor in the political system, and tends to shun governmental institutions.

3. <u>The research should examine a variety of effects schools have on communities or neighborhoods.</u> A proper research design should identify the range of common effects and supply the facual basis for a theory that can explain the variation. The object of the theory is to explain the conditions under which schools have supportive, neutral, or perverse effects on neighborhood social structures and stability. The full range of independent variables must be defined in the initial stages of case study research. Existing research suggests at least four categories of variables:

i) Neighborhood characteristics as a variable. Neighborhoods are subject to outside economic and social forces (such as changes affecting an industry that is the economic mainstay of a neighborhood or the policy of an insurance company toward purchasing mortgages for homes in the neighborhood) which distinguish them and cause some of the problems they must confront. Minimally, neighborhoods should be classified as declining, well establish and economically stable, and growing.

Economic studies suggest the schools can slow or accelerate the forces to which a neighborhood is subject, but they may not be powerful enough to reverse the direction of the forces. That is, schools may encourage some changes in neighborhoods that can be reflected only in the progress of the neighborhood relative to other similar neighborhoods.

ii) The kind of impact a school makes is variable. Existing evidence shows that schools can affect the market demand for residence in a neighborhood and the organization and voice of neighborhood social and political groups. To the extent that a school is responsible for attracting residents to a community, it also establishes the condition for residents expressing their unhappiness through "exit." As the dissatisfied begin to leave, the school and community take notice and attempt to bring about changes. "Exit" may not operate to the same degree of effectiveness in communities with weak schools that have never attracted residents.[59]

Depending on the circumstances of the neighborhood (new, stable or declining), one or another kind of school impact may be more important. The organizing effect of schools may be most important in declining neighborhoods undergoing rapid population change, slightly less important in new developments where the developer retains control, and least important in well established neighborhoods with many active organizations. On the other hand, the effect of the school's attracting new residents or retaining older ones may be more important in the new communities and the older stable ones, but less important in declining communities.

iii) School Characteristics as a variable. Schools can be characterized by a number of administrative styles that may affect their relationship with their neighborhood. They may be organized into school systems in ways that make them more or less dependent on the area they serve. In central cities, as Boyd's argument shows, public schools are subject to pressures that insulate them from their neighborhoods.[60] However, private schools are subject to precisely the opposite pressures, strongly connecting them to their central city neighborhoods. In some cases, the same neighborhood will be served by public schools that are not responsive and private schools that are--which would permit a fertile cross-ruff in the research design.

iv) The degree of integration of the school with the community may be a variable. In some cities, schools perform only educational services; in others, schools either directly perform or serve as host for other social services needed by the community, such as:

- o Youth recreation services, leagues, scouting.
- o Parks and recreation facilities (as in Chicago where the Park District and school system attempt to locate their respective facilities on adjacent land).
- o Nutrition and health services for preschool children and the aged.
- o Day care and after-school care for working parents' children.
- o Job training and placement services.
- o Special programs for drug addicts, alcoholics and similarly troubled residents.

Private schools, because they are typically attached to parishes, also become more directly involved with distressed families. Both public and private schools may develop parent organizations that concentrate on the problems of the neighborhood which directly or peripherally affect the school (such as police, fire and emergency services, traffic, housing, and the types of stores in the area). The schools are likely to help articulate concerns with the after-school activities of the

students, with illegal activities such as drug sales, gambling, and prostitution in the neighborhood, with the need for libraries and recreational areas.

The research design should reflect an awareness of the different degrees of integration schools can have with their communities, and should develop a comparative approach that could evaluate some of these differences.

4. Any research undertaken should include both public and private schools that serve the neighborhood community. The research design should select communities where public and private schools serve the same kinds of students (for example, the Beverly Hills neighborhood of Chicago, which is served by Christ the Kind School and three public schools) and in communities where the schools divide the students along majority-minority lines (for example, Santa Ana, California, where middle- and upper-middle-income white students attend public schools, and lower-income, immigrant Chicano students attend Catholic schools).

The research should also identify both communities where the public and private schools work together (for example, in the Cabrini-Green area of Chicago's Near Northside, public and Catholic schools exchange students having particular difficulties in the other type of schools) or those where there is little or no cooperation (as in the Desire section of New Orleans, where the Catholic school serves a small, isolated group of homes in the middle of a large black public housing complex and has no interaction with the mammoth public school nearby).

5. Ultimately, the object of the research is to determine whether and how schools affect a neighborhood's life. This knowledge will help clarify the cost of certain kinds of changes made by school systems for their own reasons, without reflection about their neighborhood impacts--like the decision to close smaller schools and open large ones or to adopt scatter-sight attendance districting for some neighborhoods of the system as part of a school integration effort.

Many aspects of schools that shape the way they affect their neighborhoods are already the result of laws and contract regulations. The research should examine not only how the schools interact with what effect but why they adopt the stance they

do. Do differences in local or state laws encourage the schools of one district to work closely with their community and the schools of another to ignore neighborhood needs? Do union contracts shape the school's relations to the community? Do attitudes held by the profession of teachers or school administrators produce beneficial or damaging interaction? The research should be designed to answer questions like these.

Policy applications

Understanding how schools help shape healthy neighborhoods and how they may affect, for better or worse, neighborhoods in decline is important to the leaders of public and private education, to neighborhood leaders, and to local, state and federal authorities concerned with the preservation and development of existing communities. Each year, the federal government invests billions of dollars in programs designed to stabilize neighborhoods, foster reinvestment in the inner-city, or expand the stock of housing; this investment is matched by billions from the state and local governments and the private sector. If schools are identified as primary institutions for developing and maintaining communities' stability, or for weakening neighborhoods when they behave in certain ways, the investment in revitalizing neighborhoods may be more secure, and simultaneously, schools will be recognized for their contribution to the welfare of the community.

NOTES

1. For example, the court considered extensive testimony on the tipping point effect in Trinity Episcopal School and Trinity Housing Company vs. Patricia Roberts Harriss, 0978) in which the community attempted to reverse a decision to replace mixed-income high rise housing with a 100% low-income, rent-assisted housing in New York's West Side Urban Renewal District.

2. The "tipping point" is more metaphorical than an empirical point. The phenomenon, of families moving from an area in a spree of panicked home selling, is real. But efforts to identify precisely the percentage level at which the point should be placed have failed. Quite obviously, many neighborhoods are stable with very high percentages of minority-majority racial mixes, and others "tip" when the first minority family moves onto the street. C.f. Robert G. Wegman, "Neighborhoods and Schools in Racial Transition", Growth and Change 6 (July,1975)

3. Bureau of Census, as reported by New York Times, May 24, 1980.

4. Susan Abramowitz, Stuart Rosenfeld editors, Declining Enrollment: The Challenge of the Coming Decade (Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, U.S. Government Printing Office, March, 1978). See especially Section III, pp. 355-453, passim.

5. Graham Allison argues that there may always be a strong component of bureaucratic self-interest of this sort which mutates the ends-means rationality of bureaucracies implementing policies. Bureaucracies will consistently act to maintain themselves, in ways least threatening to their existing structures, when implementing new policies. Allison provides a useful summary of the organization theory literature relevant to this point. Graham Allison, The Essence of Decision, (Boston: Little Brown, 1971), passim, esp. pp. 67-97.

6. These studies will be identified and discussed individually throughout the following sections.

7. Robert S. Lynd and Helen M. Lynd, Middletown (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1929), and Middletown in Transition (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1937); William Lloyd Warner, et al., Democracy in Jonesville (New York: Harper, 1949); August B. Hollingshead, Elmtown's Youth (New York: Wiley, 1949.)

8. Floyd Hunter, Community Power Structure (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1953).

9. Ralph B. Kimbrough, Political Power and Educational Decision-Making (Chicago: Rand McNally & Co, 1964)

10. Robert A. Dahl, Who Governs? (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1961).

11. Dahl, Who Governs?; Nelson B. Polsby, Community Power and Political Theory (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963).

12. Dahl, Who Governs?, pp.160-161; 204-205ff.

13. Ibid., pp. 43ff, 154.

14. Ibid., pp. 155-161ff.

15. Wallace Sayer and Herbert B. Kaufman, Governing New York City (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1960); Theodore Lowi, At the Pleasure of the Mayor (New York: Free Press, 1964).

16. Lowi, op. cit., Chapter 1.

17. Dahl, Who Governs?, pp. 211 ff; see also pp 154 ff.

18. Harvey Summerfield, The Neighborhood-Based Politics of Education, (Columbus: Charles Merrill Co., 1971), passim.

19. Thomas Vitullo-Martin, "Community Conflict and Policy Theory: Implications of Four Communities' Changes in Integration, Development and Pollution Control Policies", Unpublished Dissertation, University of Chicago, 1973, Chapters 2-3.

20. David B. Rogers, 110 Livingston Street (New York: Random House, 1968), pp. 281ff.

21. Diane Ravitch, The Great School Wars (New York: Basic Books, 1974), passim.

22. Ibid., p. 177.

23. Joseph G. Weeres, "School Politics in Thrity-three of the Local Community Areas within the City of Chicago," Unpubished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago,1971.

24. Paul E. Peterson, School Politics Chicago Style (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976).

25. Ibid., p.250ff;Gary Orfield, The Reconstruction of Southern Education (New York: Wiley, 1962), Chapter 6.

26. Peterson, School Politics Chicago Style, pp. 28-30.

27. Donald A. Erickson, Richard L. Nault and Bruce Cooper, Assisted by Robert L. Lamborn, "Recent Enrollment Trends in U.S. Nonpublic Schools," in Declining Enrollments, pp. 49, 81-84.

28. See, for example, the questions raised in my Catholic Inner-city Schools: The Future? (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Catholic Conference, 1979).

29. Andrew Greeley, William McCready, and Kathleen McCourt, The Catholic Schools in a Declining Church (Chicago: Aldine, 1978).

30. James R. Saunders,"The Education of Chicago Catholics: An Urban History", Unpublished dissertation, University of Chicago, 1970).

31. Thomas Vitullo-Martin, Julia Vitullo-Martin, "The Politics of Alternative Models to the Public School Systems." A Report to the Office of Education, (ERIC) 1973; Thomas Vitullo-Martin and Glenn Pasanan, "Parents, Policy and Political Structure: A Study of Policy-Making and Parental Support in non-Public Schools," A Report to the National Institute of Education (forthcoming, 1980).

32. David S. Morton, "Examining the Differences Between Public and Parochial Education: The Rhode Island Experience", in Thomas Vitullo-Martin, Catholic Inner-city Schools, op.cit., pp 99-118.

33. Vitullo-Martin, Catholic Inner-city Schools, Chapter 1, 2.

34. Vitullo-Martin, "The Politics of Alternative Models to the Public School Systems," op. cit., p. 25-27ff.

35. Ibid., p.22.

36. See further, Southern Rural Development Center, "Reopening the Consolidation Debate."

37. Allan Peshkin, Growing Up American: Schooling and the Survival of Community (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968).

38. Arthur J. Vidich and Joseph Bensman, Small Town in Mass Society (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1958).

39. Richard Wade, Slavery in the Cities: The south 1820-1860 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964), pp. 277 ff.

40. James S. Coleman, "Racial Segregation in the Schools: New Research with New Policy Implications," Phi Delta Kappa, October, 1975, pp. 75-78. Also "Presentation to Massachusetts Legislature, March 30, 1976" reprinted in Murray Friedman, et al., New Perspectives on School Integration, (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979), Chapter 10. See also, Thomas Pettigrew and Robert L. Green's response to Coleman's thesis, "Urban Desegregation and White Flight: A Response to Coleman," in New Perspectives, Chapter 12.

41. For an extended discussion of this argument, see Thomas Vitullo-Martin, "New York City's Interest in Reform of Tax Treatment of School Expenses: Retaining the Middle Class in the City," in City Almanac, Vol. 13, No. 4 (New York: New School for Social Research, December, 1978).

42. Trude W. Lash, Heidi Sigal and Deanna Dudzinski, Children and Families in New York City: An Analysis of the 1976 Survey of Income and Education (New York: Foundation for Child Development, February 1979), pp. 44-45.

43. Milton Bins and Alvin H. Townsel, "Changing/Declining Enrollments in Large City School Systems," in Susan Abramowitz and Stuart Rosenfeld, eds., Declining Enrollment: The Challenge of the Coming Decade (Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, U.S. Government Printing Office, March 1978), pp. 136-138, Table 4.4.

44. Harry H. Long and Paul C. Glock, "Short Paper: How Racial Composition of Cities Change," Land Economics, August 1975, pp. 258-267.

45. William H. Frey, "Class-Specific White Flight: A Comparative Analysis of Large American Cities," Institute for Research on Poverty Discussion Papers No. 507-578 (Madison: University of Wisconsin, October 1978), p. 1.

46. Ibid., p. 14.

47. Janet Rothenberg Pack, "Determinants of Migration to Central Cities," Journal of Regional Science, No. 13, pp. 246-260.

48. Thomas D. Crocker, "The Willingness to Pay for Air Pollution Control," AIME, Council of Economics (April, 1972); Thomas D. Crocker and R.J. Anderson, "Air Pollution and Residential Property Values," Urban Studies, No. 8, October 1971. These findings were supported in subsequent studies, e.g., A.M. Fruman, "On Estimating Air Pollution Central Benefits from Land Value Studies," Journal of Environment, Economics and Management, 1974, and A.M. Palensky, S. Shavell, "Amenities and Property Values in a General Equilibrium Model of an Urban Area," Working Paper #1207-5 (Washington, D.C.: Urban Institute, July 1973).